

The Supreme Court Update - June 18, 2026

by Andrew Brantingham, Ian Blodger, Jessica M. Leano, and Brock Huebner

On June 18, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States issued three decisions:

United States v. Hemani, No. 24-1234: This case addressed whether the prosecution of an individual who uses marijuana “every other day” under a federal law prohibiting certain drug users from possessing firearms violates the Second Amendment. During a search of his home, Hemani surrendered a gun, pointed agents to marijuana on the property, and told the agents he used marijuana about every other day. The government prosecuted Hemani under 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(3) for knowingly possessing a gun in his home while being an unlawful user of a controlled substance. The district court granted Hemani’s motion to dismiss the indictment against him as violating the Second Amendment, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed. In a 9-0 opinion by Justice Gorsuch, the Court agreed and found Hemani’s prosecution under § 922(g)(3) inconsistent with the Second Amendment. The statute bans a class of people from possessing essentially any firearm for any purpose, which shifts the burden to the government to show its prosecution complies with the Second Amendment. The government analogized the statute to historical laws addressing “habitual drunkards,” but those laws targeted different kinds of people for different reasons and operated in different ways. Justice Thomas, Justice Jackson joined by Justice Sotomayor, and Justice Alito joined by Justice Kagan, wrote concurring opinions.

View the Court’s [decision](#).

Hunter v. United States, No. 242-1063: This case addressed defendants’ ability to appeal a conviction or sentence despite an appeal waiver. Hunter entered into a written plea agreement that included his waiver of the right to appeal his conviction and sentence, with the exception of the right to raise an ineffective assistance of counsel claim. Hunter objected to a mandatory medication condition in his sentence and at the close of the hearing, the district court told Hunter that he had a right to appeal and his trial counsel would continue to represent him. Hunter appealed, and the government moved to dismiss based on the appeal waiver. The Fifth Circuit dismissed the appeal,

Related People

- Andrew Brantingham
- Ian Blodger
- Jessica M. Leano
- Brock Huebner

Related Capabilities

- Appellate

finding the district court's misstatement did not impact the appeal waiver's validity, and appeal waivers are enforceable with only two exceptions, neither of which applied: when the waiver was tainted by ineffective assistance of counsel and when the sentence exceeded the statutory maximum. In an 8-1 opinion written by Justice Kagan, the Court vacated and remanded for the Fifth Circuit to decide whether enforcing the appeal waiver would result in a miscarriage of justice. An agreement not to appeal a sentence is unenforceable when it would result in a miscarriage of justice—when it would leave in place the kind of egregious error that would bring the judicial system into disrepute. Justice Gorsuch filed a concurrence joined by Justices Sotomayor and Jackson, Justice Kavanaugh filed a concurrence joined by Justices Alito and Barrett, and Justice Barrett filed a concurring opinion. Justice Thomas dissented.

View the Court's [decision](#).

T.M. v. University of Maryland Medical Sys. Corp., No. 25-197: This case addresses whether the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine applies only to final judgments rendered by the highest court of a state, or whether it also bars suit when the state-court judgment remains subject to further review in state appellate proceedings. T.M. filed a “flurry of litigation” in state and federal courts related to her involuntary commitment. T.M. and Respondents negotiated a settlement, and a state judge entered a consent order that required T.M.'s immediate release and imposed other conditions, including T.M.'s dismissal of all pending actions against Respondents with prejudice. T.M. then found new counsel and sued Respondents in federal court, seeking a declaration that the consent order violated her state and federal due process rights. The district court dismissed the complaint under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Fourth Circuit affirmed, rejecting T.M.'s argument that *Rooker-Feldman* only applies to final judgments from the highest court of a state in which the decision could be had. In a 5-4 opinion written by Justice Sotomayor, the Court affirmed, holding that *Rooker-Feldman* bars federal district court jurisdiction over cases brought by state-court losers who complain of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court proceedings commenced and seek district court review and rejection of those judgments. The doctrine applies regardless of whether the state-court judgment remains subject to further review in state appellate proceedings. Justice Barrett filed a dissenting opinion, joined by Chief Justice Roberts and Justices Kagan and Gorsuch.

View the Court's [decision](#).

On June 15, 2026, the Court granted certiorari in three cases:

Genalo et al. v. Black et al., No. 25-886: This case involves 8 U.S.C. § 1226(c), under which certain criminal aliens are required to be detained pending a decision on whether they are to be removed from the United States. The questions presented are: 1. Whether there is a point at which an alien's detention under § 1226(c), pending a decision on whether he is to be removed, becomes "unreasonably prolonged" such that due process requires a bond hearing, 2. If so, whether, in such a bond hearing, due process requires placing the burden on the government to justify the alien's continued detention by clear and convincing evidence, and 3. Whether one of the cases appealed from is now moot.

Guerrero v. Johnson, No. 25-1003: The Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA) prohibits successive habeas applications by state prisoners with only narrow exceptions. The question presented is: Whether a claim relies on a "a new rule of constitutional law, made retroactive to cases on collateral review by the Supreme Court, that was previously unavailable" when the habeas petitioner could have asserted a claim based on the rule in a prior federal habeas petition.

Kian v. Florida, No. 25-6623: This case arises from the petitioner's unsuccessful challenge in state appellate courts of his conviction by a six-person jury. The question presented is: Whether Petitioner was deprived of his right, under the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments, to a trial by a twelve-person jury when the defendant is charged with a serious felony.